

Amendment – Ser. No. 10/758,474
July 8, 2005
Page 6

REMARKS

The Office Action outstanding against this application has been carefully reviewed along with the references cited therein. In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 6-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035,848 to Ray et al. (Ray). Claims 5 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ray.

Claims 1-4 and 6-19

Independent Claims 1 and 10

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to define applicants' hinge assembly more clearly. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to define the claw as being adapted to be inserted into an associated mounting receptacle between upper and lower edges of an opening defined by the associated mounting receptacle. Also, claim 1 now specifies that the latch that is movably connected to the claw is movable to and between a locked position where the latch is adapted to engage the upper edge of the opening of the associated mounting receptacle to prevent separation of said claw from the associated mounting receptacle (see *latch K engaged with edge M4b in FIGS. 5, 7 of applicants' disclosure*). Amended claim 1 also specifies that, in the unlocked position, the latch obstructs return movement of the body from its second operative position into its first operative position (see *latch K as shown in FIGS. 2, 6 blocking movement of the body/channel B back to its first position*).

Independent claim 10 has been amended to specify that the latch, when in its locked position, engages the upper edge of the mounting receptacle opening to prevent movement of the claw in the opening thereby preventing decoupling of said claw from the mounting receptacle.

In contrast, Ray does not disclose or fairly suggest a latch that engages the upper edge of the mounting receptacle opening to prevent decoupling. The latch 24 of Ray instead captures the pin 74 in the slot 72 of the claw/hanger 22 – the latch 24 of Ray never acts against the upper edge of the receptacle opening as defined in amended claims 1 and 10.

Claims 3-9 and 12-20 depend respectively from claims 1 and 10 and are respectively submitted to be allowable with their respective independent claims.

Amendment - Ser. No. 10/758,474
July 8, 2005
Page 7

Conclusion

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

July 8, 2005
Date



Steven M. Haas (Reg. No. 37,841)
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582